United States Environmental Protection Agency
Office of Water EPA - 820-S-12-002
MC 4304T December 2012

Preventing Eutrophication: Scientific Support for Dual Nutrient Criteria

Summary

Nutrient pollution resulting from excess nitrogen (N) and phosphorus (P) is a leading cause of degradation of U.S. water quality. The scientific literature provides many examples that illustrate the effects of both N and P on instream and downstream water quality in streams, lakes, estuaries, and coastal systems. Development of numeric nutrient criteria for both N and P can be an effective tool to prevent eutrophication and protect designated uses in the nation's waters. The purpose of this fact sheet is to describe the scientific basis supporting the development of criteria for both N and P. It does not address the flexibility that states and authorized tribes have to prioritize the development of criteria based on nutrient management strategies.

Background

Nitrogen and phosphorus together support the growth of algae and aquatic plants, which provide food and habitat for fish, shellfish and other organisms that live in water. Excess N and P in aquatic systems can stimulate production of plant (including algae and vascular plants) and microbial biomass, which leads to depletion of dissolved oxygen, reduced transparency, and changes in biotic community composition -- this is called eutrophication [30]. In addition to the impacts on aquatic life, excess nutrients can also degrade aesthetics of recreational waters [29, 33, 34], and increase the incidence of harmful algal blooms, which may endanger human health [2].

Under the Clean Water Act, states and authorized tribes are responsible for establishing water quality standards that specify appropriate designated uses, establish criteria to protect those uses, develop anti-degradation policies and implementation methods, and provide for the protection of downstream waters. Numeric nutrient criteria are an important element of water quality standards and are an effective tool for preventing nutrient pollution, for example, in helping to derive numeric limits in discharge permits. Development of numeric nutrient criteria is one aspect of a coordinated and comprehensive approach to nutrient management [42]. EPA has published several guidance documents to assist states and authorized tribes in deriving numeric nutrient criteria for both N and P to protect aquatic systems [36, 37, 38, 40, 41].

In waters where a nutrient-related impairment has already been identified, focus on a single nutrient may be warranted to restore designated uses. This may be the case in waters with strong single nutrient limitation or those without significant connection to downstream waters that have a different limiting nutrient. In these instances, evaluation of data on nutrient limitation status is needed to determine how N and P concentrations affect the aquatic systems.

Why develop criteria for both N and P?

Nutrient management efforts have traditionally focused on controlling a single limiting nutrient (i.e., N or P) based on a paradigm that assumes primary production is N-limited in marine waters and P-limited in freshwaters. Conceptually, the assumption is that if the key limiting nutrient is controlled, primary production is limited and the cascading effects of eutrophication do not occur. In practice, however, there are scientific reasons that make this an overly simplistic model for management of nutrient pollution as described below.

Trophic status may vary both spatially and temporally.

The scientific literature demonstrates that nutrient concentrations vary across a landscape as a result of a multitude of factors, including climate, flow, geology, soils, biological processes, and human activities. This variability in concentration means that the relative contribution of and limitation by N and P can change spatially and temporally - even within the same watershed.

There are numerous examples in the scientific literature documenting exceptions to the conventional nutrient limitation theory. For example, N limitation has been shown to occur in lakes with small watershed areas relative to size [16], streams have demonstrated temporal and spatial changes in nutrient limitation [9, 35], many estuaries show seasonal shifts from P limitation in spring to N limitation in summer [3, 6], and co-limitation is commonly observed across freshwater and marine systems [8, 13]. Because of the highly variable nature of nutrient limitation in aquatic systems, numeric criteria for both N and P provide the greatest likelihood of protecting aquatic systems.

Aquatic flora and fauna have a diverse set of nutritional needs.

The concept of single nutrient limitation relies on the assumption that at any moment in time the growth of all organisms will be limited by the nutrient in shortest supply. However, the scientific literature demonstrates that aquatic flora and fauna have different nutritional needs. Some species may exhibit N limitation while others show P limitation or co-limitation by both N and P [8, 9, 12, 15, 23, 32]. Because of the diversity of nutritional needs amongst organisms, numeric criteria for both N and P are more likely to protect aquatic systems.

N fixation does not fully offset N deficiency.

Arguments for controlling P only in freshwaters have relied on the idea that reductions in N are compensated by cyanobacterial N fixation. It has been suggested that this process undermines N control and serves to maintain P limitation [26]. This theory has also been extended to marine waters [27], yet scientific evidence indicates that N fixation is not able to fully offset N deficiency in either fresh or marine waters [14, 16, 21, and 28]. Because N fixation is highly variable across waterbody types, numeric criteria for both N and P are likely to be more effective in protecting aquatic systems.

Both N and P have a role in protecting downstream waters.

Focusing on only the perceived limiting nutrient in upstream waters can enhance export of the uncontrolled nutrient downstream. For example, limiting P in streams can reduce phytoplankton biomass, which, in turn, can make N more available for transport downstream [22]. Waters where N and P concentrations exceed saturation thresholds are particularly vulnerable to becoming nutrient sources [1, 19, 20].

Both N and P are important to consider when assessing downstream impacts at any scale (e.g., 10 miles, 100 miles, or 1000 miles from the source). For example, nutrient concentrations in streams may not trigger an adverse effect until some distance downstream where other factors - light, temperature, substrate, or velocity - no longer suppress the response to nutrients [5, 10, 11, 17, 43]. Lakes with a nutrient limitation status sufficiently different from that of upstream waters may also be impacted by upstream nutrient loads [18]. Estuarine and coastal waters are especially sensitive to upstream sources given that they are physically, chemically, and biologically distinct from freshwater systems [3, 4].

Research in the Northern Gulf of Mexico highlights the importance of considering both N and P when assessing downstream impacts. Increasing N inputs from the Mississippi River into the Gulf of Mexico have been observed to change the trophic status of the Gulf, overtime forcing P limitation [34]. In 2007, EPA's Science Advisory Board (SAB) recommended that reduction strategies for both N and P be implemented to protect downstream waters in the Gulf [39]. The SAB recommendation has been supported by more recent research demonstrating that reductions of both N and P to the Gulf of Mexico should be implemented to protect aquatic habitat and limit further expansion of the low dissolved oxygen zone [4, 7, 24, 25].

Conclusion

Nutrient pollution is a major cause of degradation in U.S. waters. Given the dynamic nature of aquatic systems and the need to protect downstream waters, the weight of the scientific evidence supports the development of nutrient criteria for both N and P. In waters where a nutrient-related impairment has already been identified, focus on a single nutrient may be warranted to restore designated uses.

For More Information

Contact Brannon Walsh at 202-566-1118 or walsh.brannon@epa.gov. Additional information on the development of numeric nutrient criteria is available on our website: http://water.epa.gov/scitech/swguidance/standards/criteria/nutrients/guidance_index.cfm

References

1. Alexander et al. 2009. Dynamic modeling of nitrogen losses in river networks unravels the coupled effect of hydrological and biogeochemical processes. Biogeochemistry 93: 91-116.

2. Anderson et al. 2008. Harmful algal blooms and eutrophication: Examining linkages from selected coastal regions of the United States. Harmful Algae 8. 39-53.

3. Conley, D. J. 2000. Biogeochemical nutrient cycles and nutrient management strategies. Hydrobiologia. 410:87-96.

4. Conley et al. 2009. Controlling eutrophication: Nitrogen and phosphorus. Science. 323:1014-1015.

5. Dodds W. K., 2006. Eutrophication and trophic state in rivers and streams. Limnology and Oceanography. 51(1, part 2): 671-680.

6. Downing et al. 1999. Meta-analysis of marine nutrient-enrichment experiments: variation in the magnitude of nutrient limitation. Ecology, 80, 1157–1167.

7. Duan et al. 2011. Temperature Control on Soluble Reactive Phosphorus in the Lower Mississippi River? Estuaries and Coasts 34: 78-89.

8. Elser et al. 2007. Global analysis of nitrogen and phosphorus limitation of primary production in freshwater, marine, and terrestrial ecosystems. Ecology Letters. 10:1135-1142.

9. Francoeur, S.N. 2001. Meta-analysis of lotic nutrient amendment experiments: detecting and quantifying subtle responses. Journal of the North American Benthological Society 20:358–368.

10. Fisher, S. G. and G. E. Likens. 1973. Energy flow in Bear Brook, New Hampshire: an integrative approach to stream ecosystem metabolism. Ecological Monographs 43:421 – 439.

11. Fuller, R.L., J.L. Roelofs, and T.J. Fry. 1986. The importance of algae to stream invertebrates. Journal of North American Benthological Society 5: 290-296.

12. Greenwood et al. 2007. Nutrients stimulate leaf breakdown rates and detritivore biomass: bottom-up effects via heterotrophic pathways. Oecologia 151:637–649.

13. Harpole et al. 2011. Nutrient co-limitation of primary producer communities. Ecology Letters, 14: 852–862.

14. James et al. 2003. Nitrogen driven lakes: the Shropshire and Cheshire meres? Arch. Hydrobol. 158:249-266.

15. Jansson et al. 2001. Nutrient limitation of bacterioplankton and phytoplankton in humic lakes in northern Sweden. Freshwat. Biol., 46(5): 653-666.

16. Lewis and Wurtsbaugh. 2008. Control of Lacustrine Phytoplankton by nutrients: Erosion of the Phosphorus Paradigm. International Review of Hydrobiology. 93: 446-465.

17. Lewis et al. 2011. Rationale for Control of Anthropogenic Nitrogen and Phosphorus to Reduce Eutrophication of Inland Waters. Environmental Science and Technology. 45, 10300-10305.

18. Malueg et al. 1975. A Six-Year Water, Phosphorus, and Nitrogen Budget for Shagawa Lake, Minnesota. Journal of Environmental Quality. 4(2):236-242.

19. Mulholland et al. 2008. Stream denitrification across biomes and its response to anthropogenic nitrate loading. Nature. 452: 202-206.

20. Mulholland and Webster. 2010. Nutrient dynamics in streams and the role of J-NABS. The North American Benthological Society. 29(1): 100-117.

21. Paerl, H.W. 2009. Controlling eutrophication along the freshwater-marine continuum: dual nutrient (N and P) reductions are essential. Estuaries and Coasts 32:593-601.

22. Paerl et al. 2004. Solving problems resulting from solutions: The evolution of a dual nutrient management strategy for the eutrophying Neuse River Estuary, North Carolina , USA . Environmental Science and Technology. 38: 3068-3073.

23. Pick, F. R. 1989. Species specific phytoplankton responses to nutrient enrichment in limnetic enclosures. Arch. Hydrobiol. Beih. Ergebn. Limnol. 32, 177–187.

24. Quigg et al. 2011. Going west: Phosphorus limitation of primary production in the Northern Gulf of Mexico and the importance of the Atchafalaya River. Aquatic Geochemistry. 17: 519-544.

25. Rabalais et al. 2009. Global change and eutrophication of coastal waters. ICES. J Mar Sci 66:1528–1537.

26. Schindler et al. 2008. Eutrophication of lakes cannot be controlled by reducing nitrogen input: Results of a 37 year whole ecosystem experiment. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA 105: 11254-11258.

27. Schindler, D.W., 2012: The dilemma of controlling cultural eutrophication of lakes. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences.

28. Scott, J.T., and M.J. McCarthy. 2010. Nitrogen fixation may not balance the nitrogen pool of lakes over timescales relevant to eutrophication management. Limnology and Oceanography 55: 1265-1270.

29. Smith, D.G., G.F. Croker, and K. McFarlane, 1995. Human Perception of Water Appearance 1. Clarity and Colour for Bathing and Aesthetics. New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 29: 29-43.

30. Smith et al. 1999. Eutrophication: Impacts of excess nutrient inputs on freshwater, marine, and terrestrial ecosystems. Environmental Pollution.

31. Smyth, R.L., M.C. Watzin, and R.E. Manning, 2009. Investigating Public Preferences for Managing Lake Champlain using a Choice Experiment. Journal of Environmental Management 90: 615-623

32. Sundareshwar et al. 2003. Phosphorus limitation of coastal ecosystem processes. Science 299:563–565.

33. Suplee, M.W., V. Watson, M. Teply, and H. McKee, 2009. How Green is too Green? Public Opinion of what Constitutes Undesirable Algae Levels in Streams. Journal of the American Water Resources Association 45: 123-140.

34. Sylvan et al. 2007. Eutrophication-induced phosphorus limitation in the Mississippi River plume: Evidence from fast repetition rate fluorometry. Limnology and Oceanography. 56(6):2679-2685.

35. Tank, J. and W. K. Dodds. 2003. Responses of heterotrophic and autotrophic biofilms to nutrients in ten streams. Freshwater Biology 48:1031-1049.

36. USEPA. 2000a. NutrientCriteria Technical Guidance Manual: Rivers and Streams. EPA-822-B-00-002, Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Office of Science and Technology,Washington, DC.
37. USEPA. 2000b. Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual. Lakes and Reservoirs. EPA-822-B-00-001, U.S. EPA, Office of Water, Office of Science and Technology, Washington, DC.
38. USEPA. 2001. Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual. Estuarine and Coastal Marine Waters. EPA-822-B-01-003. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC.
39. USEPA Science Advisory Board. 2007. Hypoxia in the Northern Gulf of Mexico: An update by the EPA Science Advisory Board. EPA-SAB-08-004.
40.USEPA. 2008. Nutrient Criteria Technical Guidance Manual. Wetlands. EPA-822-B-08-001. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Water, Washington, DC.
41. USEPA. 2010. Using Stressor-response Relationships to Derive Numeric Nutrient Criteria. EPA-820-2-10-001. U.S. Office of Science and Technology, Washington, DC.
42. USEPA, Office of Water. 2011. Memo from Nancy Stoner to Regional Administrators. Working in Partnership with States to Address Phosphorus and Nitrogen Pollution through Use of a Framework for State Nutrient Reductions.
43. Vannote, R. L., G. W. Minshall, K. W. Cummins, J. R. Sedell, and C. E. Cushing. 1980. The river continuum concept. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 37:130 – 137.